

REMARKS

This paper is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated March 27, 2008, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 29-53 are pending in the present application. With this Response, no claims have been amended, and no new matter has been introduced. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 29-53 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Chow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,010,002, hereafter "Chow") in view of Kalmanek, JR. et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/00076222, hereafter "Kalmanek"). The Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the reasons noted below.

The Applicants maintain that Chow and Kalmanek, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in at least independent claims 29, 42, 45 and 48. For example, claim 29 recites the following features:

"[a] terminal apparatus ...comprising:

...an adjustment unit operable to detect a holding period during which the corresponding relationship is held in the router, and to set a period shorter than the holding period as a sending interval at which the data is sent;

wherein said communication unit is operable to send the data repeatedly to the router according to the sending interval." (Emphasis added).

The features emphasized above in claim 29 are similarly recited in independent claims 42, 45 and 48. Specifically, claim 42 is directed to a method, claim 45 is directed to program, and claim 48 is directed to a system having similar features noted above for the adjustment unit of claim 29.

The Applicants maintain that Chow and Kalmanek (individually or in combination) fail to disclose or suggest the following features of adjustment unit, method and code respectively recited in independent claims 29, 42, 45 and 48:

"detecting a holding period during which a corresponding relationship is held in a router, and setting a period shorter than the holding period as a sending interval at which the data is sent."

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied on the combination of Chow and Kalmanek for

disclosing or suggesting the features noted above independent claims 29, 42, 45 and 48. Specifically, the Examiner relied on Chow for disclosing or suggesting all the features in independent claims 29, 42, 45 and 48 except for the features of the adjustment unit, method or code recited respectively in the above claims. Instead, the Examiner relied on Kalmanek for disclosing or suggesting the features of the adjustment unit, method or code recited respectively in the above claims.

At the outset, the Applicants agree that Chow fails to disclose an adjustment unit operable to detect a holding period during when a relationship between global and local is held and set a period shorter than the holding period as a sending interval (see Office Action, pg. 2). Specifically, although Chow discloses that the wireless device can use any standard second-generation or third-generation wireless protocol, nothing in Chow discloses or suggests an adjustment unit, method or code that detects a holding period during which a corresponding relationship is held in a router, and sets a period shorter than the holding period as a sending interval at which the data is sent.

However, the Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Kalmanek.

In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that Kalmanek discloses a network address translator (i.e., table 10) for translating global addresses to local addresses as well as the details about releasing of the global addresses (see e.g. ¶ [0130]). The Examiner alleges that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the communication unit disclosed in Chow (see e.g., col. 3, lines 43-46 and Fig. 1) with the above teachings of Kalmanek to obtain a system containing a router holding local/global addresses.

Additionally, the Examiner relies on the "KEEP ALIVE" messages discloses in Kalmanek for disclosing the features of the adjustment unit, method or code recited in independent claims 29, 42, 45 and 48. Specifically, as described in Kalmanek, the "KEEP ALIVE" messages indicate to a router the state of a connection (e.g., still alive and healthy) while the connection is on hold (see ¶ [0398]). Thus, the Examiner alleges that this feature of Kalmanek discloses the detection of a holding period during which the corresponding relationship between a local address and a global address is held, as recited in claims 29, 42, 45 and 48.

However, the Applicants maintain that Kalmanek merely discloses that the interval between the “KEEP ALIVE” messages is engineered to minimize the chances of false error detection (see ¶ [0401]). Thus, it is clear that Kalmanek neither detects a holding period during which the corresponding relationship between a local address and a global address is held in the router, nor sets a period shorter than the holding period as a sending interval at which the data is sent.

On the other hand, in the present invention (as recited in claims 29, 42, 45 and 48) an internet terminal sends a data packet every polling interval that is shorter than the holding period for the corresponding relationship stored in the router. The corresponding relationship stored in the router is between a global address assigned to the router and a local address of a terminal apparatus. Thus, it is possible for the router to always have the information necessary to convert from a global address into a local address, and thereby affect control of a home appliance during polling intervals. No such advantages are disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art.

Based on the above discussion, no combination of Chow and Kalmanek would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claims 29, 42, 45 and 48. Likewise, no combination of Chow and Kalmanek would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 30-41, 43, 44, 46, 47 and 49-53 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 29, 42, 45 and 48.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the Office Action dated March 27, 2008, and pass this application to issue.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazuhiko AIZU et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By: 2008.06.27 16:23:22 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/emj
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 27, 2008